

BIBLE SEPARATION

[The following article was written by Dr. Charles J. Woodbridge nearly twenty-five years ago. Keep in that in mind when the names of various men and institutions are mentioned. We are printing it for several reasons. First, it forthrightly deals with vitally important issues such as: How important is Bible separation? Are there different degrees of separation, i.e., first degree, second degree, etc. which must be applied only in certain situations ? Is it unloving or unwise to mention the names of men and institutions which refuse to practice Bible separation? Second, with the passage of time, it is obvious that continuing compromises on the part of major evangelical leaders have left most believers today at the mercy of the "wolves in sheeps clothing" which are welcomed into the flock. Instead of warnings concerning these false teachers, most believers are hearing only words of praise. Third, the failure to practice and teach Bible separation has robbed most believers of the spiritual discernment which is essential for spiritual growth. Fourth, those leaders who are willing to obey God's command to "reprove, rebuke and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine" are few and far between.

Dr. Woodbridge's ministry over the years has been a great blessing to us. It is rare indeed to find a man who is a recognized scholar, holding B.A., A.M., Th.B, and Ph.D. degrees who has maintained a humble spirit with a history of subjecting all human knowledge to the test of the Word of God. For many years he has ministered to others literally around the world as a pastor, missionary, teacher and author who has not failed to declare "all the counsel of God." We can give personal testimony to fervent love for the Truth as well as his loving spirit and sincere desire to be of help to those being led astray by the error of the wicked in these deceptive last days. We praise God for his willingness to speak the truth in love.FOUNDATION Magazine].

CONTENTS: Introduction The New Evangelical Menace The New Evangelical Organizational Structure The Astonishing New Evangelical Advance The Initial Retreats A New, More Complicated Peril Advocates of Mere "First Degree" Separation The Fallacy of the Distinction The Consequences of this Untenable Distinction What Invitations Shall Bible Believers Accept? Can the New Evangelical Advance be Arrested?

DURING the 1930s a group of Presbyterian ministers, led by Dr. J. Gresham Machen, sought to stem the rising tide of apostasy in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. I was one of the group. Traveling from coast to coast across America we alerted Presbyterians against the insidious enemy known as Modernism-unbelief in the Word of God. Many a pastor took a fearless stand for the Faith. Some of us were disciplined by the Presbyterian Church. But a standard was effectively raised for the truth of God.

While our voices were being lifted in Presbyterian circles, stalwarts in other denominations, valiant men who were not swayed by promises of ecclesiastical preferment but who determined to champion the Word of God at any cost to themselves, were also being heard in words of solemn admonition. Many of these noble warriors for God are now in heaven. The heritage of courage and conviction they bequeathed will long be remembered.

During the 1960s I felt called of the Lord to warn believers again --not Presbyterians alone this time, but the church universal -- against another deadly foe. This was the New Evangelicalism, or spirit of compromise with unbelief. In this ministry my journeys took me around the globe: to Africa, Europe, South America, Asia, Australia over sounding the alarm in defense of the Word of God. Finally my words of warning were printed. The book is called THE NEW EVANGELICALISM. God has honored it.

As it was in the 1930s, so it was in the 1960s. From many quarters of the globe strong protests against, and denunciations of the New Evangelicalism were heard.

Now the 1970s have dawned. Once more I feel constrained to issue a note of warning against a new, more sinister error. My constrain is not self-induced. I feel sure that it is of the Lord.

I must confess that as I pick up my pen to analyze and criticize this new error my soul is grieved within me. For in clarifying what I believe to be the plain teaching of the Word of God, and in seeking to bring earnest Christians to the point of decision to stand against the error and unequivocally for the Faith, it will be necessary for me to mention names - names of men of God many of whom in years past have been my personal friends and associates in the proclamation of the gospel.

I cannot but hope, perhaps naively, but nonetheless sincerely, that if this booklet falls into the hands of any of these men they will reconsider their conduct in the light of the Scriptures and return to the pathway of obedience.

What then is this novel error which Bible believing, warmhearted Christians must clearly understand and studiously shun? I shall describe it later. But first we must understand the nature of the New Evangelicalism, its organizational structure, its steady advance, the retreat of men who should be defenders of the Faith and the consequent theological chaos.

The New Evangelical Menace

Dr. Harold J. Ockenga of New England invented the term "The New Evangelicalism " He is the father and arch-promoter of the movement. Insisting that the key-word in the furthering of the gospel is no longer Biblical separation from, but infiltration into apostate churches, he has brought into being a theological monster before which Gargantua would seem to be a mere pygmy!

The downward steps which the New Evangelicalism has taken with incredible swiftness are toleration of unbelief, cooperation with unbelief and speedy capitulation to unbelief.

All this of course is in flat contradiction of such passages of Scripture as Romans 16:17; Titus 3:10; 2 John 9-11. Because of its flagrant disobedience of the Word of the living God the New Evangelicalism must be branded as "evil."

The Bible teaches: "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil" (Psalm 97:10). Obedient to this injunction, Bible believers must hate, not the new evangelicals themselves (they should pray for them), but everything related to the New Evangelicalism. Their hatred of this evil is due to the fact that they love the Lord God with all their hearts; and that they will consequently reject anything that even seems to contradict His blessed, unalterable Word

The New Evangelical Organizational Structure

When one goes into battle it is wise to know the number, the strength and the disposition of the enemy's forces.

Those who would defend the Faith of their fathers against the New Evangelicalism have one distinct advantage. Dr. Ockenga has told them the precise line-up of his new movement. This is very fortunate indeed. For now believers are able to be on their guard against the assaults of the enemy.

We- have been informed with great care that the New Evangelicalism has an organizational structure. It has agencies, or arms, or branches. It manifests itself through specific channels. Excellent! Old-fashioned, Bible believing Christians may now be on their toes, watching out for these new evangelical agencies and studiously avoiding them.

Before I list the four major agencies of the New Evangelicalism, several extremely important questions arise.

Are you, dear reader, genuinely willing in this day of apostasy to stand for the Bible at any cost? Do you have the courage flatly to repudiate the New Evangelicalism in all its manifestations? The apostle Paul stood for the defence of the Faith (see Philippians 1:7, 17). Are you willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with him?

If you are swayed by human opinion rather than by the Scriptures, if your eyes are on any man instead of on your blessed Saviour, if your criterion of what constitutes the will of God be human "success" instead of unswerving loyalty to the Word of God, then what follows in this booklet will seem to you thoroughly meaningless and unduly divisive.

But if your judgment and consequent conduct are based solely upon what God has said in His Word, then of course you will reject the New Evangelicalism and have nothing whatever to do with anything even remotely related to it.

To maintain this position of obedience ruggedly and inflexibly is by no means the pathway of popularity. People will wonder why you are not following the crowd. They may even regard you as peculiar or antediluvian! Never mind. It is far better to obey God than to seek the plaudits of men!

What then are the four agencies which Dr. Ockenga lists as salient features of the New Evangelicalism? They are the National Association of Evangelicals, Fuller Theological Seminary, Christianity Today and the ecumenical evangelism displayed on such a vast scale by Dr. Billy Graham.

The Astonishing, New Evangelical Advance

The armies of the new evangelical error have swept forward with amazing rapidity. They have captured citadel after citadel of the Faith.

The National Association of Evangelicals, with its broad inclusivism and its insistency upon "positivism" rather than "negativism," has broken down one battlement after another. Fuller Theological Seminary, with its ever-hazier definitions of Biblical Inspiration, its increasing willingness to cooperate with unbelief, and the broadening Influence of its faculty's writing and lectures, has weakened the resistance of many a less sophisticated or technically educated pastor. Christianity Today, a dull sword when it comes to the defence of the Faith, but a sharp weapon in the promotion of ecumenical evangelism and kindred types of theological defection, has cut a wide swath through the ranks of relatively uninstructed but intellectually ambitious men. And ecumenical evangelism, with its world-wide publicity and its hosts of followers, has caused a multitude of potential defenders of the Faith to weaken. What does it matter that the famous evangelist is a friend of the iniquitous World Council of Churches? Is he not the friend of presidents of the United States of America? Then why not abandon our clear cut principles of Biblical separation and flock to his standard of disobedience?

The Initial Retreats

Would you not have expected that God's people, after the first impact of hostile attack, would have rallied to the banner of old fashioned orthodoxy and challenged the foe right down the line?

If that was your expectation it was not realized. Instead men and institutions in which you had confidence for years began to crumble and compromise. The time has come to name some of these men and institutions.

I have delayed the writing of this booklet for years. But now I can restrain myself no longer. Let two things be perfectly clear. First, I am sadly aware of my own shortcomings. Second, I am pronouncing judgment, not upon men as such, but upon their deeds. For the church of Christ

must know the truth in detail. Apart from the Almighty we would indeed be in desperate straits. But praise

God that He is on His throne! His will and Word will ultimately prevail!

What do I mean by men in retreat? A few examples out of many will suffice.

Ecumenical evangelism came to Los Angeles. A Billy Graham Crusade was launched. The honorary chairman was Bishop Gerald F. Kennedy of the Methodist Church, who openly denied the deity of Christ.

On the platform was a Bible teacher, well-known in southern California. He was a member of the sponsoring committee of the Crusade, apparently seated amicably close to the Methodist blasphemer. What was he doing there in the first place? Years later (in 1968) he wrote that he was willing to do the same thing all over again. Has he forgotten Romans 16:17 and Titus 3:10?

Who was this man? You may have heard his name. You may even listen avidly to his radio Bible teaching. He was none other than Dr. J. Vernon McGee. Can you understand why good people are confused? But the worst is yet to come!

We are in the 1970s. A great Prophetic Congress is held in Jerusalem. The publicity folder reaches you through the mail. You discover that the chief promoter of the Congress whose picture adorns the folder is none other than Dr. Ockenga, founder of the New Evangelicalism. On his sponsoring committee: Pat Boone of Nevada nightclub fame; Tom Skinner, revolutionary evangelist who blasphemously calls our blessed Savior a gutsy, radical, contemporary revolutionary," and terms His resurrection gone of the greatest political coups of all time."

Knowing what you do about the New Evangelicalism, and being persuaded as you are that God is holy and that His name is reverend, you are about to throw the folder into the ash can.

But you see another picture on the folder-the picture of a man in whom you have long had confidence. He is scheduled to be at the Congress as Bible teacher. Apparently he is not disturbed to work hand in glove with new evangelicals. His name is Dr. Wilbur M. Smith. And accompanying him on this strange, mixed up junket are Dr. Charles Feinberg, dean of Talbot Theological

Seminary and Dr. John Walvoord, president of Dallas Theological Seminary.

Talk about a hodge-podge! You can scarcely believe your eyes! You ask the question: What in the world is going on?

You will reach one of three conclusions. Either worldliness and blasphemy are not evil after all. They have been ennobled by the presence of these well-known names. Or the total theological situation is in such a frightful mess that no one can disentangle its strands of logic. Or - and this is the correct conclusion: for some reason known only to themselves and the living God these men are willing to join hands in a common enterprise with men who apparently reject such portions of the Bible as Romans 16:17, Titus 3:10, and 2 John 9-11.

In my opinion at least this is an outright betrayal of Biblical orthodoxy. The fact that so many pastors and Christian laymen succumb to the appeal of these names and disregard the new evangelical character of the Prophetic Congress reveals the dismal depths into which a lack of conviction has brought the church of God!

Observe now the retreat of Christian educational institutions. God's people cannot be too careful in their choices of which Bible institutes, colleges and theological seminaries to support. Biola College, for example, has long merited the respect of Bible believers. But when ecumenical evangelism came once more to the southern California area, did Biola reject it because it was an arm of the New Evangelicalism? That would have been an unpopular, but a noble and Biblical position. But that is precisely what Biola did not do. Her Board reputedly with unanimity endorsed the Crusade!

Where does that leave Biola supporters? Shall they too lower their flags and compromise? Or shall they retain Biola on their prayer list but refuse to lend the school any further support?

The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago has had a long and honored career in teaching and defending the Faith. As early as 1934, in the days of president James M. Gray, I was a speaker at the Moody Founder's Week Conference. I used to rejoice in the school's testimony, as I did in that of Biola. But what now?

Dr. Will jam Culbertson, president of the Institute, is also editor of The Moody Monthly. For years the magazine has been condoning and promoting ecumenical evangelism, which, you will recall, Dr. Ockenga listed as a manifestation of the New Evangelicalism. This is sad indeed. But it is true.

What then is the duty of Bible believers? Shall they ignore this downward trend at Moody? Shall they argue that, although the Institute looks with favor upon the New Evangelicalism, she is at heart still sound and worthy of support? Or shall they keep their eyes wide open and realize that the school which they once loved appears to be slipping badly?

Dallas Theological Seminary has also had a distinguished career. For years I was a visiting lecturer there. I resigned, for I detected the swift inroads of the New Evangelicalism into the life of the school.

Do you ask for proof of the downward trend at Dallas? Need I remind you that the president of the school was willing to participate in the multi-hued Prophetic Congress in Jerusalem? Or that for years he has been a member of the Board of Campus Crusade, which multitudes of men of God now regard as new evangelical to the core?

In examining Dallas' theological position let us use Dr. Ockenga's own yard-stick. Christianity Today, he has told us, is one of the prime exhibits of the New Evangelicalism. Yet in 1965 Dallas Seminary invited the editor of the magazine to lecture on the campus and I have seen a letter written by the president of the institution praising the editor's masterly presentations!

When Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Deerfield, Illinois, came into the lime-light in the 1960s, many of us hoped that the institution would be strong enough to resist the onslaughts of the New Evangelicalism. But our hopes were soon shattered.

I have before me as I write a recent commencement program of the school. The order of events is listed in detail. But during commencement week ecumenical evangelism came to Chicago. What did the school authorities do? Did they act with theological fortitude and continue their program without interruption? Quite the contrary. Instead they supinely scheduled no "on-campus events" for the day on which the Graham Crusade started. And they actually printed in their program: "Graduates, families and friends are encouraged to attend meeting at McCormick Place." I asked a graduating senior whether at least one faculty member or one student raised a protest against this ignominious surrender to the New Evangelicalism. To date I have received no encouraging reply to my query.

In my opinion at least, Ichabod (the glory is departed) should be written above the entrance of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

May I ask in all candor: Where are our schools leading us? Are we like silly sheep following their slippery paths? Or are we standing for the truth of God?

The sad story of educational compromise in other schools is long, tedious and disappointing. It is wise for Christians who desire to remain loyal to the Word of God to keep their eyes on that Word and not to deviate from its mandates no matter how strong, persuasive or magnetic the forces of compromise may be.

I have often asked myself the question why men who, while they would probably reject for themselves the title "new evangelical," retreat from the battle as the New Evangelicalism advances. They are men of unquestioned integrity and probably men of good will. They have spent hundreds of hours studying the Bible. Then how can they possibly first retreat from and then join forces with the advancing new evangelicals ?

Could it be that they do not regard New Evangelicalism, with all its anti-Scriptural compromises, as evil after all? Could it be that in their hearts they know that it is indeed evil

but that they are unwilling, lest they endanger their public image, to hate it and openly to challenge it? Could it be that they do not wish to "rock the boat," to hurt the institutions they represent, or to appear contentious before men? Have they adopted the care-free, alive and let live" attitude that demands no spiritual valor or effort? Or could there be some private, personal reason for their ready acquiescence and refusal to take an open stand against the New Evangelicalism? The Christian public is looking to them for fear less leadership. Why do they appear to have failed in this leadership and to have lowered their standards in the face of increasingly virulent attacks? Why do some of these men actually defend the new evangelicals while at the same time attacking loyal defenders of the Faith? Their consciences must sooner or later answer such questions .

It is sad indeed to watch men and institutions in headlong retreat. But there is also a happy side to the story. Thank God that some schools are still standing true to the Faith. They are regarded here and there as isolationist or guilty of right-wing extremism. But they refuse to budge from their orthodox position. Reader, search out these schools and befriend them!

Advocates of Mere "First Degree" Separation

Mr. Jack Wyrzten, of the Word of Life Fellowship, writes that he has "never gone along with secondary separation." Dr. Tim La Haye, Baptist pastor of San Diego, California, confesses: "We consider ourselves rock ribbed uncompromising first degree separationists," although he admits he does "share" a few second degree separation convictions!

Doubtless many other pastors and Christian leaders agree with the position championed by Mr. Wyrzten and Dr. La Haye. Note carefully that both men, quite independently of each other, try to distinguish between degrees of separation. From New York to California this hopeless effort is being made!

But perhaps the leading evangelical minister who seems to disapprove of "secondary" separation while seeking to maintain "primary" separation is Dr. John R. Rice, editor of The Sword the Lord. In his editorials he has repeatedly asserted that as long as a man believes the Bible, accepts the Christ of the Bible and is a soul winner, he can in good conscience have fellowship with him. Dr. Rice has taken pains to elaborate this thesis. In view of the fact that his pen wields influence perhaps his position should be examined more closely.

In a message delivered by Dr. Rice in 1959 he raises the question of fellowship, for example, with a man in the Southern Baptist Convention who is supporting the Convention program.

If you have kept up with what has been going on in the Southern Baptist Church during the last few years; if you understand that the denomination has been steadily declining theologically; if you have watched its shift in moral values, evidenced, for example, in its worldly telecast "Tell It Like It Is", - if you have done all these things then you would probably expect to hear that Dr. Rice would have no fellowship with supporters of the Southern Baptist program.

Instead, and perhaps to your amazement, you discover that Dr. Rice states that if such a supporter is "for Christ and the Bible", and if he is right on certain basic Christian doctrines, and does not make any "divisive issue" over his support of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. Rice would go right along with him.

I am aware that Dr. Rice uttered these words in 1959. But his subsequent editorials have made it plain that his views in this area have not changed.

The Fallacy of the Distinction

The effort made by these men and others to differentiate between "first degree" separation and "second degree" separation, while it may appeal to undiscerning souls, is contrary to the Word of God. I make this assertion fully expecting it to be contradicted but confident that it is true !

To be separate from means to be separate from! To hate evil means to hate evil! There must be no linguistic gymnastics or spurious verbal compromise here. Our authority is not human opinion but the everlasting Word.

In Dr. Rice's message he quoted at the outset a powerful verse of Scripture, - a verse which should have settled the matter for him once for all. This is how his message commenced: "I am a companion of all them that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts" (Psalm 119:63). In other words, the Psalmist's fellowship was with those who were characterized not only by their fear of the Lord but also by their obedience of His precepts.

The word "keep" in Hebrew means to "hedge about", i.e. to guard, to attend to, to be circumspect, to observe. The test of fellowship for the Psalmist was not only reverence towards God, but, as already intimated, obedience as over against His revealed will.

The obverse of this is also true. A believer can have no true fellowship either with those who do not really fear God or with those who walk in disobedience. His separation extends beyond a primary relationship. It extends to a secondary, or tertiary, - or to any relationship in which disobedience to God is involved.

Do you remember the Levitical laws of cleansing as they are recorded, for example, in Leviticus 15? According to these laws and their basic principle has never changed-when a man for one reason or another was unclean everything he touched was unclean. No one was to touch him ("first degree" separation). But by the same token no one was to touch the bed on which he lay or the chair on which he sat ("second degree" separation). Why this stringent command? Because the Lord God wanted His cleansed people really to be separated from contamination.

Jude is equally explicit. The believer is not only to avoid contamination with foul flesh ("first degree" separation), but he is also to hate "even the garment spotted by the flesh" ("second degree" separation). Study Jude 23.

The apostle Paul deals with the subject too. He writes: "Now we command you brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which ye received of us" (11 Thess. 3:6). This is the Pauline concept of Biblical separation.

Bear in mind, please, that Paul is not discussing unbelievers but "every brother", i.e. every Christian who is walking disorderly before God. What exactly does the apostle mean? In the effort to escape the severity of his command, some have reasoned that he was referring only to lazy members of the early church, to those who refused to work and had become busybodies (read 2 Thess. 3:7-12).

But a careful exegesis of verse 6 makes it plain that Paul links "disorderliness" in this context with the "tradition" which he faithfully transmitted to the Thessalonians in which they in turn had received. This "tradition" extended far beyond laziness! It embraced the whole counsel of God which Paul loyally proclaimed wherever he went. What he is telling the Thessalonian church this: "Withdraw yourselves even from Christian brethren if they are cheating in contravention of the holy purposes of God."

This command has never been repealed. For the simple reason that the God of the twentieth century is still the holy and righteous One who inhabits eternity and who will still countenance no dealings whatever with that which offends His unsullied name.

The Bible knows nothing whatever about "degrees" of separation from evil! The Christian is to remove himself as far as it is humanly possible from all forms of evil, whether they be o or peripheral, pivotal or relatively ancillary. To hate evil means to hate it in all its forms-its ancestry, its immediate presence and its progeny!

May I present to my readers Governor Nehemiah, wonderful Hebrew servant of the living God, who had never heard of any distinction between "first degree" and "second degree" separation? He believed in complete, absolute separation in accordance with the mandates of the Lord! Read his record carefully. Be not swayed by the dictates of "half-way" separationists! During Nehemiah's absence from Jerusalem open iniquity brazenly installed itself in Jerusalem. The inhabitants of the city were desecrating the Sabbath. Nehemiah returned and testified against the people (Neh. 13:15). But merchants from Tyre continued to sell their wares in the city on the Sabbath, Nehemiah acted swiftly. He drove the merchants out, shut the city gates and posted guards to halt the unwarranted traffic.

The slamming of the gates might lightly be called "first degree" separation! But Nehemiah did not stop there. He believed in genuine, full-orbed, totalitarian, Biblical separation! The

merchants of Tyre, excluded from the city, lodged near the wall, ready to pounce upon the populace with their fish and other merchandise as soon as the gates were opened.

What did Nehemiah do? Did he reason thus: "After all, they are without the gates; it is none of my business that they are lurking in the shadows"? He did not. He was a "secondary", "tertiary" (and as many other numerical adjectives as are needed), obedient separationist. He threatened to lay hands on the merchants (Neh. 13:21), even though they were "extra-mural"; and they retreated in disarray!

Paul tells us that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning . . ." (Rom. 15:4). May we learn from the example of Nehemiah!

This new, ephemeral, imaginary, non-Biblical distinction between "first" and "second" degree separation is a deadly menace.

If a villain enters your home with his pistol pointed at your wife and murder in his eye, what do you do? Put him out and close the door. This is "first-degree" separation. But if you see him later through the window crouching on the lawn, priming his pistol, preparing for a second intrusion, do you piously argue: "'First degree' separation, yes; 'second-degree' separation, no!" You do not. You telephone the police! And if perhaps you have had lingering negative thoughts which delayed your action, you summon an ambulance!

I am reminded of what is happening in America's national life. It is tragic. We will not hobnob with the Vietcong on the battle field, for we believe in "first-degree" separation! But we will have rather cheerful fellowship with Russia, which is supplying the Vietcong with bullets to kill our boys! Why? Because national sentiment frowns upon "second degree" separation!

The Consequences of this Untenable Distinction

Why in the world do some of our hitherto trusted leaders reject "second-degree" separation? We must not examine their motives, which are known only to themselves and God. But the results of their strange philosophy are distressing indeed. In my opinion at least, they are weakening the defences of the Faith and confusing pastors, missionaries, evangelists and students who are trying to contend for the integrity of the Word of God.

How does this come to pass? Well, here for example is a servant of Christ who for years has been contending for the Faith. Then the pressure of the conflict begins to crush him. He begins to capitulate to the enemy. He condones New Evangelicalism. He supports ecumenical evangelism. He thus betrays the cause of rugged, unyielding orthodoxy. But he is not dismayed. His friends who are still resisting the New Evangelicalism will not rebuke him. They believe only in "first degree" separation. They will still welcome him with open arms as though he were not a defector. They will still promote him as though he were no compromiser. Thus, in spite of

his new attitude of appeasement toward the enemy, he has lost little if any of his prestige and reputation for orthodoxy.

Then why not pull down our flags and surrender our convictions? We shall not suffer thereby!

Moreover, the emphasis upon "first degree" separation and the rejection of "second degree" separation not only provides a cozy refuge for compromisers. It also furnishes would-be compromisers with a philosophical (but not a Biblical) platform or basis for compromise. Perhaps they begin to feel that it is no longer necessary really to hate evil. One may "hate" it in its most obvious and virulent forms, but ignore it in its relatively "innocuous" forms! This is not the teaching of the Word of God. The practical, down to earth effects of making the distinction between "degrees" of separation are devastating!

Mr. Jack Wyrzten, I feel sure, is honest and sincere in his repudiation of "second degree separation." Note the sad consequences.

On his list of summer speakers is Dr. Bob Cook, President of The King's College. Dr. Cook was president of the National Association of Evangelicals. So far as I know he has never renounced his relationship to that new evangelical organization. Moreover, he told me personally that he would gladly have gone along with the Graham Crusade in Los Angeles.

Dr. William Culbertson, President of Moody Bible Institute and defender of ecumenical evangelism, is an honored speaker at Word of Life Camps, and penned the introduction to a book Mr. Wyrzten has recently written.

Dr. Charles Anderson, long a member of the Board of Denver Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, widely regarded as new evangelical, is one of Mr. Wyrzten's main-stays. Years ago I besought Dr. Anderson to resign from the Board. He steadfastly refused.

What is the net effect of this sort of continuous mixed fellowship? The lines of demarcation between rigid loyalty to the Word of God and placid disloyalty are erased!

Dr. Tim La Haye of San Diego, spokesman for "first degree" versus "second degree" separation, is now reported to have eighteen young people from his church active in Campus Crusade, considered by increasing numbers of informed Christians to be thoroughly new evangelical, and he vehemently defends the use of the Crusade's "Four Spiritual Laws."

And what of Dr. Rice? Why does he promote in The Sword of the Lord Dr. Criswell, a supporter of the Southern Baptist Convention; or Dr. Sam Sutherland, under whose presidency of BIOLA the institution, in the opinion of great numbers of Christians, became new evangelical? Or why does Dr. Rice invite Dr. Culbertson to be the speaker at a Sword of the Lord banquet?

The answer is invariably the same. "These men who are promoted believe the Bible and love souls. Never mind about their entangling compromises! Forget their encouragement of the New Evangelicalism! Our arms of warm fellowship are open to them!"

In the city of Columbus, Ohio, the names of at least two pastors are well-known. Dr. William Ashbrook, brilliant and warm-hearted defender of the Faith, is one of these pastors. The other is Dr. J. Richard Hankins of the Columbus Baptist Temple, a supporter of the Graham Columbus Crusade.

When Dr. Rice came to Columbus, with which of these two pastors did he cooperate, with the defender of the Faith, or with the supporter of ecumenical evangelism? Rejecting as he implicitly does "second degree" separation, he cooperated with the supporter of ecumenical evangelism! And he did so because although he, Dr. Rice, was not personally in favor of ecumenical evangelism, Dr. Hankins "wins many more souls than Brother Ashbrook". Dr. Hankins believes the Bible and wants to win souls. According to Dr. Rice that is sufficient. Dr. Hankins' deadly compromises are relatively unimportant! Dr. Rice has actually written that if Brother Hankins wins many more souls than Brother Ashbrook, then of the two he would choose the one who is the best soul winner as the better Christian and a man more after God's heart!

Incidentally, I have rarely met a greater soul-winner than Dr. Ashbrook. But that is not the point. The point is that when a man repudiates "second degree" separation he has broken down a Biblical wall of defence and the flood-tide of compromise may readily flow into the fortress of the beleaguered remnant of faith!

Bible believers everywhere, beware! Do we or do we not really hate evil in all its manifestations? We yearn to see souls saved. We pour out our very lives in pointing the lost to the Saviour. But never at the expense of compromise!

What Invitations Shall Bible Believers Accept?

Shall pastors, missionaries and evangelists who desire to be true to the Word of God accept invitations to speak in compromising churches and institutions? One possible answer to this question is: "Yes. I am aware that the organization is condoning the New Evangelicalism. But when I go there I can raise a voice for orthodoxy and perhaps convict the compromising leaders of their faults.

A California pastor who is known as orthodox told me: "I accepted an invitation to this compromising school and in my message I pointed out its compromise and denounced it!"

Over against this specious reasoning the Word of God is crystal clear! If a church or an institution of learning has become theologically unclean what is our duty? "Touch not the unclean thing" (2 Cor. 6:17). With as much patience as I could must I pointed out to this pastor

that "Touch not" means "Touch not", regardless of the fact that one's purpose might be to tell the "unclean thing" that it is unclean! Obedient servants of Christ must refuse in any way to line up with groups which are abetting the New Evangelicalism.

Have you ever wondered why questionable schools and churches invite defenders of the Faith to speak under their auspices? Could not the answer be that they can then publicize the presence of these fine men in their midst as a proof of their own orthodoxy? Men of God, are you willing to serve as window-dressing for error?

Can the New Evangelical Advance be Arrested?

The effective onrush of the New Evangelicalism will not be halted by any half-way measures. Bible believers need to spend much time in prayer and to beseech the Holy Spirit of God to aid them in their efforts to withstand the foe. Then by the grace of God, with humility and godly fear they must courageously meet the advancing charge head-on!

How specifically can they deal with all forms of error, whether it be the New Evangelicalism itself or the spirit of compromise with the New Evangelicalism? The answer is in one word: BOYCOTT! There is only one effective way to treat both the new evangelicals and their fellow-travelers. That is to boycott them. This is not cruelty. It is loyalty to the Scriptures! Until this is done the enemy's attack will continue with unabated force. If it is done on a wide scale the attack may be stopped in its tracks!

My prayer is that Christian leaders who have erred in this area will take the time to restudy their position, and that they will then re-trace their steps and re-assume their position of Biblically oriented leadership. If they do I for one would heartily praise the Lord.

In the meantime let us pray for all who are retreating instead of advancing in attack against every form of compromise. And let us personally determine to maintain the Faith of our fathers at all costs.

We may be called upon to suffer for our stand. Dr. Charles H. Spurgeon of the Metropolitan Baptist Tabernacle of London suffered for his loyal adherence to the Word of God. His position was that of the Bible, the very standard I have sought to raise in this booklet. On Oct. 7, 1888 he stated: "That I might not stultify my testimony, I have cut myself clear of those who err from the faith, and even from those who associate with them."

That is true Biblical separation! And to his noble utterance many Bible believers will still say a hearty "Amen!"